DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 148 EA 028 440

AUTHOR Erevelles, Nirmala
TITLE Re-Constituting the "Disabled" Other: Historical Materialism and the Politics of Schooling.
PUB DATE 1997-03-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Critical Theory; *Disabilities; *Disability Discrimination; Educational Discrimination; *Educational Sociology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Marxian Analysis; Power Structure; Social Bias; Social Structure

ABSTRACT

Within the current historical crisis of transnational capitalism, disabled people are finding themselves increasingly at risk. It is essential to (re)theorize the category of disability, particularly in critical response to the emancipatory possibilities offered through "border pedagogies." The paper locates the conceptual category of disability as the central ordering force within the social relations of schooling in much the same manner as theorists of race, class, gender, and sexuality have done before and ask the following questions: What does disability mean within the current global capitalist economy? How has global capitalism historically maintained the marginal "otherness" of disability? In what ways is disability related to the other social differences produced through race, class, gender, and sexual orientation? Through these questions that locate disability as the central analytic within the social relations of schooling, the paper demonstrates how this move will not only destablize the discursive meanings of disability, but will also challenge and reconstitute the historical, economic, political, and cultural structures that construct and shape lives in schools and therefore in society at large. A historical materialist analysis can foreground the necessity to transform the exploitative capitalist social relations that have historically marginalized disabled subjects. (Contains 54 references.) (LMI)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 148

Re-Constituting the "Disabled" Other: Historical Materialism and the Politics of Schooling

Nirmala Erevelles
Cultural Foundations of Education & Women's Studies Program
350 Huntington Hall
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244

Tel # (O): (315) 443-3707
Tel # (H): (315) 475-8225

e-mail address: nerevell@mailbox.syr.edu

Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting at Chicago, March 1997.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. Erevelles
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 028 440

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

In this paper I am going to argue that it is essential to (re)theorize the category of disability, particularly in critical response to the emancipatory possibilities offered through "border pedagogies." To do this, I want to the locate conceptual category of disability as the central ordering force within the social relations of schooling in much the same manner as theorists of race, class, gender, and sexuality have done before and ask the following questions: What does disability mean within our current global capitalist economy? How has global capitalism historically maintained the marginal "otherness" of disability? In what ways is disability related to the other social differences produced through race, class, gender, and sexual orientation? Through these questions that locate disability as the central analytic within the social relations of schooling, I wish to demonstrate how this move will not only destabilize the discursive meanings of disability, but will also challenge and reconstitute the historical, the economic, political, and cultural structures that construct and shape our lives in schools and therefore in society at large.

Re-Constituting the "Disabled" Other: Historical Materialism and the Politics of Schooling

Within the current historical crisis of transnational capitalism, disabled people are finding themselves increasingly at risk in their bid for economic survival. With the shifting of production processes to offshore locations in search of cheaper wage labor, along with rising unemployment, and the reduction of social welfare spending, disabled people have increasing found themselves, now more than ever, relegated to the ranks of a redundant population. Moreover, these proposed reductions in public spending have also had detrimental effects on public education whose more specialized programs for marginal populations like students with disabilities have increasingly faced drastic cuts. In light of this economic restructuring and its accompanying reorganization of the social sphere, I wish to argue in this paper that there is an urgent need to offer a critical theory of disability that seeks to transform its economic and social marginality.

The effects of social transformation deriving from this economic restructuring have been extensively described by critical theorists of education with reference to populations marked by difference on the basis of race, class, gender, and sexuality (Sleeter and McLaren 1995; Weis, 1988; Weis and Fine, 1992; Giroux, 1992; McLaren 1989; Apple 1995). And still, there has been an ominous silence around the social category of disability. This is because disabled people have historically been located at the margins of the margins of our social world in spaces that have been construed as irrelevant to the economy, society, culture, and even radical theory. I utilize Mary O'Brien's (1987) conceptualization of "commatization" to describe the often cursory inclusion of disability among other theories of difference, where critical social analyses now take up the newly expanded sociological trinity of race comma class comma gender comma sexual orientation, and now, comma disability. I argue here that this view is limited because no attempt is made to analyze the actual conditions under which disability is socially produced nor to examine the consequences of these constructions of disability in the historical context of transnational capitalism.

Moreover, the "new" critical theorists of education, in their attempts to theorize the possibilities of emancipatory subjectivities for populations marked by difference have sought to distance themselves from a focus on these economic issues in their analyses. They have, therefore, repudiated marxist discourses claiming that the complexities of social difference cannot be explained away through "the singularities of 'class' or 'gender' as primary conceptual and organizational categories" (Bhabha 1994, p. 1). They have argued, instead, that a more effective response is to make a theoretical shift in the analyses of "social difference" from the "material" to the "metaphoric." In this view, then, these critical theorists of education have joined forces with poststructuralist theorists in the area of cultural studies (that include feminist, postcolonialist, and black studies) so as to "read" schooling as a site of cultural politics which can utilize radical pedagogies of possibility for the construction of oppositional subjectivities through a language of contestation and struggle. Central to this view is that the construction of "social difference" is defined primarily as an effect of language where "deviance" is now seen as *written* on the material body (i.e. through race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and now disability) which through *(re)signification* can allow such bodies to (re)possess emancipatory, transgressive, hybrid subjectivities that continually transgress borders and open up unlimited possibilities. Giroux (1994) names these pedagogical interventions as "border pedagogies" which aim to produce the

"pedagogical conditions in which students become border crossers in order to understand otherness in its own terms, and to further create borderlands in which diverse cultural resources allow for the fashioning of new identities within existing configurations of power" (Giroux 1992, p. 28).

These emanciaptory possibilities articulated through "border pedagogies" seem applicable to disabled subjects particularly within the context of special education. Special education, by its very definition, signifies borderlands that mark the boundaries between the conditions of "normality" and "abnormality" on the basis of the presumably "objective" measure of academic achievement in schools. However, these borderlands have also been an extremely contested terrain. In recent years, a group of special educators have proposed a Regular Education Initiative that has challenged the impermeability of these borders and sought to reconfigure these borders in an efforts to uphold an inclusive education for all children notwithstanding the nature and extent of their disability (Stainback & Stainback, 1992). In doing this, these educators have attempted to undermine the intransingency of the normative borders of the regular classroom by proposing alternatives to traditional classroom management strategies, curriculum planning, and teaching and evaluation methods so that all children, irrespective of their disability can participate within the classroom space. By arguing for students with "different abilities" to be included within these classrooms spaces, inclusive education has in many ways mirrored the intent of border pedagogies to open up possibilities for a "multi-centric perspective that allows students to recognize and analyze how the differences within and between various groups can expand the potential of human life and democratic possibilities" (Giroux 1994, p. 34).

However, I intend to argue in this paper that these interventions through inclusive education, even while they challenge the dominant practices in education actually leave unaltered the "actual" conditions under which the construct of "disability" is produced within our schools. To do this, I will demonstrate in this paper that "disability" does not emerge on account of bad attitudes, nor is it the product of flawed meaning systems as both liberal and poststructuralist theories seem to imply. This is because cultural borders that exclude students with disabilities from the regular classroom have their roots in the social organization of transnational capitalism which requires efficient, productive, and able-bodied laborers to support its quest for the maximum accumulation of profit. Since labor is central to people's lives, especially for those who do not own the means of production, then the exclusion of these individuals from the social world of "work" (eg. disabled people) constructs them as economically vulnerable and therefore devalued in society. Therefore, in this paper, I will first utilize the marxist method of historical materialism to explain how the historical, economic, and social structures have constructed and shaped the construct of disability. I will then demonstrate why a critical pedagogy that is truly transformative needs to re-situate its terrain of transformation from the contingencies of discursive practices to the concrete material conditions obtained under transnational capitalism. Rejecting the claims by poststructuralists that marxist discourses of historical materialism are in fact reductionist, I will argue, instead that a historical materialist analysis can in fact foreground the necessity to transform the exploitative capitalist social relations that have historically marginalized disabled subjects.

In Search of The Disabled Subject : A Border Sociology

What constructs the social category of disability as a challenge to most theories of the

body is its "separateness" from all other categories of difference on account of the real and often visible physical and mental differences that may exist. In fact, the very categorization of disability has been based on the comparison of all bodies to the now mythical norm of the white, heterosexual, bourgeois, healthy, able-bodied male. Whereas society has seemed more amenable towards including other marginalized groups, people labeled disabled who are still stigmatized in all aspects of social life. Therefore, on account of their relegation to the borders, most people with disabilities experience what Biklen and Bogdan (1977) have termed handicapism to refer to a "theory and a set of practices that promote unequal and unjust treatment of people because of apparent and assumed physical and mental disabilities...[and which] manifests itself in relations between individuals, in social policy, and cultural norms and in the helping professions as well" (p. 206).

Historically, the institutionalization of scientific knowledges about disability as a tangible, identifiable, physiological condition that exemplifies deviant difference or abnormality, had its roots in the historical arrival of the Enlightenment in Europe. In a period where the notion of "truth" as a product of rational, scientific thought gained ascendancy over supernatural explanations of reality, utilizing scientific methods that would reveal the "truth of science" became the principle means by which the boundaries of "normality" were defined (Foucault, 1965; 1975; Safford and Safford, 1996). Framed as "deviant" by both the pathological model employed by medicine and the statistical model advanced by psychology and education, disability has therefore represented the most intransigent Other among all other categories of difference, namely race, class, gender, and sexuality (Mercer, 1973).

Critical of the medical perspective that represents the immutable characteristics of the disabled subject, liberal theories of disability have sought to rescue the disabled subject from the stranglehold of medical discourses. Thus, liberal sociological theory has challenged the historical attribution of deviancy associated with the disabled body through labeling theories, theories of deviance and stigma, symbolic interactionism, and more recently theories of a sociology of acceptance (Goffman, 1963; Becker, 1964; Bogdan and Taylor, 1982; Biklen and Duchan, 1994). In these arguments, disability is primarily understood not as an irrefutable medical condition but instead as a variation in "role performance" that conforms to the norms of the social system being studied (Mercer, 1973). These "social roles' such theorists argue are not pre-ordained, but are in fact socially constructed through the social interactions between individuals and social groups. Rejecting the universality and transcendence of objective truth, this social interactionist position, reifies individual experience as itself uniquely "truth producing," and thereby gestures towards normalization by extending to the disabled individual the possibility of defining him/herself as the humanist subject (Biklen and Duchan, 1994). In this way, such theorizations by celebrating individualism through a particular form of "lifestyle politics" thereby supports "the ethical construct of capitalism where one has to be free to do what one wants, free to buy and sell, to accumulate wealth or to live in poverty, to work or not, to be healthy or to be sick' (Navarro, as quoted in Doyal, 1981, p. 36). However, what gets ignored in such analyses are the historical reasons why "disability" has become a necessary category in the social and economic organization of our world.

Critical of liberal humanism, poststructuralist theories of difference, on the other hand, privilege the "public sphere of language and action that must become at once the theater and the

screen for the manifestation of the capacities of human agency" (Bhabha 1994, p. 189). Thus, Fox (1994) models the poststructuralist reading of "sickness" (or disability) in the following way:

> What I want to suggest is that concepts of health and medicine have been constituted in these popular representations as "floating signifiers', by which I mean ideas which - rather than having any intrinsic or stable meanings are available as mediators of all sorts of different meanings and associations. As such 'health' and 'medicine' may have come to have much less fixed significance as a consequence of popular cultural representations. In this way, real life may come to resemble fiction, rather than vice-versa. In fact, it can no longer make any sense to privilege 'reality' as the bedrock upon which such imagery can be grounded (p. 154).

When 'reality' is read as privilege and 'real life' itself is read as 'fiction' then the social relations that construct disability can be nothing but a 'fictionalized space" that is always open for continuous and ceaseless interpretation. Thus, this postmodern reconceptualization of disability, unhampered by historical, economic, political, and social constraints eventually culminates in a postmodern invention, a fictional entity - a cyborg (Harraway, 1990). This cyborg world that (dis) abled subjects would inhabit might be a world "in which people are not afraid of their joint kinship with animals and machines, not afraid of permanently partial identities and contradictory standpoints" (Harraway, as quoted in Sandoval (1995, p. 413). In other words, as Chela Sandoval (1995) reiterates, this invention of a cyborgean subjectivity, "being a technologized metaphorization of forms of resistance and oppositional consciousness" (p. 410), is assumed to be able to provide both a language and a praxis of possibility for society's most marginal populations.

In liberal and poststructuralist (re)theorizations of disability, the focus on disability has centered mostly on explaining how it has been constituted. Such descriptions prove to be useful in that they have been able to produce for disabled people a reference point that offers a critique of the normative structures that have contributed to their continued stigmatization. However, at the same time we need to also rigorously investigate "the why of the representation, that is to say, the politics of representation; why a given representation at a given historical moment is acceptable as a representation of "something" to the members of a particular group of people with historically determined class/gender/race relations (Zavarzadeh, 1989; p. 58)

Therefore, I am suggesting that we need to take up an analyses of disability that utilizes historical materialism. Historical materialism rejects the populist understanding that disability is produced and maintained as a result of "bad attitudes" (liberalism) or "oppressive meaning systems" (poststructuralism), but instead seeks to expose the concrete material conditions that have produced these attitudes and meanings systems about disability, in the first place. This is because, the historical materialist explanation locates as central to its analysis the concept of labor - which Marxists claim is the very foundation of society and an essential component in the continued social production of life. Therefore, what is produced and how that production is organized become central to the shaping of our social history. In other words, in this materialist analysis, it would be necessary to examine *where disabled people are located within*

these prevailing social relations of production, why is it that this location has produced conceptualizations of disability that are exclusionary and/or exploitative, and how such a location benefits capitalism in particular ways. This centrality of the social relations of production is explained by Marx (1859) as follows:

> In the social production of their life, men [sic] enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political, and intellectual life process in general. *It is not the consciousness of men [sic] that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness* (p. 4).

Fischer (1996) points out, "the essential thing about the philosophy of history developed by Marx is that it always proceeds from *social reality*, not from abstract categories: from the simple material production of life, not from intellectual constructs: from practice, not from a set of self-generating, self-developing, self-resolved ideas (Fischer, 1996; p. 98). Therefore, while historical materialism focusses on the concrete reality of labor in its changing historical context that constitutes the materiality of human existence, the marxist method of the dialectic which Ollman (1993) describes in the following quote, enables us to examine the "process" by which our social reality is constituted at any historical moment as well as the "social relations" that go to constitute this social reality

> [D]ialectics is a way of thinking that brings into focus the full range of changes and interactions that occur in the world (p.10)...Dialectics restructures our thinking about reality by replacing the common sense notion of the "thing" as something that *has* as history and *has* external connections with other things, with notions of "process," which *contains* its history and possible futures, and "relation," which *contains* as part of what it is its ties with other relations (p. 11).

Therefore, to take up this historical materialist analysis of disabled persons would suggest that we (re)insert the category of disability into social history and mark its uneven development - the shifts, the changes, and the movements - the dialectic - that has accompanied the historic construction of disability within historically specific economic structures and to thus explain "how and why social differences -specifically gender, race, sexuality, and class [and disability]- have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation, so that we can change them" (Ebert, 1996; p. 7).

Further as Marx and Engels (1857) have also argued, "the multiple forces of production accessible to men [sic] determines the nature of society, hence that the history of humanity must always be treated and studied in relationship to the history of exchange and industry" (p. 50). Thus, given the material context in which disabled people have been historically excluded from

participation in the labor force, an examination of " the multiple forces of production" can explain how and why disabled individuals are located outside of the economy, of society, and even of history.

Re-constituting Historical Borders: Disability and the Dialectics of Difference

Within dominant frameworks, the history of disability has always occupied a space sequestered from all other written histories of humankind (Safford & Safford, 1996). However, this continued isolation of the history of disability is not surprising, because these historical records have only adhered to the dominant modes of writing history, where "[o]ur understanding of scholarly work or research follows exactly the same logic as that of the colonizers and scientists: they cut apart and separate parts which constitute a whole, isolate these parts, analyze then under laboratory conditions and synthesize them again in a new man-made, artificial model (Mies 1986; p. 77). To compound this problem further, as a direct legacy of the medical model, disability is treated as a biological category located outside history, and is therefore denied any form of historical subjectivity. Therefore, this denial of the subjectivity and history of disabled individuals is enmeshed in a dialectical contradiction such that the denial of the subjectivity of disabled individuals as physiologically unable to represent themselves in normative ways (e.g. disabled individuals are understood as childlike) has resulted in a denial of their history, because in not being able to offer a representation of their own lives in relation to the social world, they are once again constituted as subjects outside of history. Further, unlike other marginal groups, disabled individuals, for the large part have seldom been understood as a political community (except perhaps for the deaf community), and therefore any recording of a history of disabled people has seldom been a social history. Most records of the history of disabled individuals have usually been restricted to the history of the specific and the local - and to the history of disabled people as individuals instead of as a community (Sarason and Doris (1979) being the exception).

In this section, I am therefore going to illustrate the process by which the conceptual category of "disability" got written out of history. Whereas a complete historical analysis of this phenomenon is outside the scope of this paper, I am instead going to take a particular instance in history - the transformation of Western feudalism into capitalism and mark the ways in which "disability" got socially institutionalized as "deviant difference; its emergence connected to "the emergence of a modern society: the professionalization of medicine, the rise of *medicine* as a 'natural science', the rise of *science* and of *modern economy*" (Mies 1986; p. 83). In this way, I am going to demonstrate how a historical materialist reading of "disability" has its genealogical origins not in physiology, but in the complex forms of control constructed so as to organize the body for particular modes of production and which in recent times has developed into sophisticated technologies and social practices that continue to uphold global capitalist production (Foucault, 1963).

Safford and Safford (1996) observe that neglect and cruelty meted out to disabled people in both feudal and pre-feudal societies was not in fact a universal phenomenon, because in several instances, acceptance and inclusion of disabled people in local communities had also been observed. This observed variation in the treatment of disabled individuals leads Safford and Safford (1996) to conclude that "primitive" practices of driving away evil spirits or leaving disabled infants to die were often responses to the economic conditions and the social resources

available for the community to sustain itself. In other words, it was not so much deviance in and of itself, but the social and economic conditions in which deviance was located that determine its definition inside and outside the sphere of social activity. Thus, it can be argued then that way in which "magic" and "religion" reacted to deviance embodied in individuals was not in fact a "natural" response, but one that was structured by the economic and social relations of the time.

The transformation from a feudal society to a capitalist economy necessitated changes both in the economic and social spheres. Whereas feudalism required "divine order" and armed retainers to maintain the peasant population in subordination to the feudal lords, the expansion of the capitalist economy on the other hand engedered the ideology of free enterprise and universal rights. However, as alternative histories have recorded, this transformation of the economy from feudalism into capitalism and the construction of the modern state of Western Civilization was dependent on violence, subordination, and exploitation on a global scale exemplified in colonialism and imperialism, characterized by the appropriation of mineral resources, cash crops and land, as well as human labor as slave labor (Rodney 1981; Mies 1986; Blaut 1989; Callinicos 1993).

It is in this context then, that the logic of the free market and notion of universal human rights has historically always stood in stark contradiction to the violence embedded in capitalist accumulation and therefore required some means by which to suppress all visible modes of coercion and control. For example, for the peasants in Europe, who were no longer the property of the feudal lord, but now free laborers under the presumed liberatory auspices of capitalism, the promise of these humanistic ideals was still a distant dream. As Peter and Favret (1975) document in 19th century France:

> ....For once the revolutionary tempest had passed over and society had been forcibly remolded by the Empire, what picture did the country people present in the resurrected society? What were the tidings announced to these beings by the wholly formal equality of rights and the freedom to acquire property? The truth is that nothing had changed. Animals they [the peasants] remained; the discourse of ascendancy had not shifted. They were as alienated as they could be -beasts or things, something close to nothing, who could not seriously be thought to have anything to say.....But was this really possible? If we were still monsters and henceforth your equals, what were you? (p. 182).

The premise of the free market economy of capitalism promising universal access to free enterprise was negated by the consolidation of the accumulation of capital in the hands of a the small and rapidly developing capitalist class. This capitalist class was able to gain ascendancy and control over the proletariat (the working class), who were now bound to the capitalist class through the seemingly objective relations of wage labor. Therefore, as the above quote indicates these conditions produced contradictions because even "free enterprise" is not independent and depends on cheap labor and therefore there was a need to construct new ideologies, no longer stigmatized by the superstition of religious discourse, but instead emergent from the objective dictates of a secular science to justify and thereby "naturalize" these divisions of labor in modernizing capitalist societies. It is in this context then, that I situate the emergence of the construct of "disability," now scientifically proven to represent inalienable "deviance," now being

attributed qualities of social inferiority; and now, also institutionalizing the necessity to isolate and segregate these populations from those designated "normal."Therefore, I am arguing here that establishing "disability" as a pathological condition emerged from the material vicissitudes of social upheaval in 17th and 18th century Europe.

The disintegration of feudalism and its shift in emphasis from agriculture to industrial production displaced a large population of peasants who now had to migrate to urban centers in search of waged employment (Foucault, 1963; Trent, 1994; Paul, 1995). With the urban centers unable to manage this vast influx of migrants who lived in conditions where pauperism, violence, and crime flourished, the bourgeoisie was compelled to devise more efficient means to control these populations. It was these circumstances that initiated the construct of the welfare state with its proliferation of poor houses, hospitals, correctional facilities, asylums, and educational institutions in order to offer economic relief to those populations unable to participate in capitalism's labor force as well as to protect the bourgeoisie from any threat these conditions would pose to capitalist accumulation (Foucault, 1963; Trent, 1994; Paul, 1995; Safford & Safford, 1996).

Therefore, the medical, judicial, and educational institutions were assigned the task to assist the capitalist state in this venture. While educational institutions were given the task of socializing these populations into the new capitalist economy, the medical and judicial systems were appointed to categorize individuals and to arbitrate any conflict arising from such categorizations (Foucault, 1975). Thus, these institutions in each of their assigned roles constructed complex methods by which to separate those having no labor potential to sell (the deserving poor) from those refusing to sell their labor (the undeserving poor) to the capitalists (Ferguson, 1994; Stone, 1984). The former, once identified, were relegated to a life of isolation, and segregation in state institutions, while the latter were rehabilitated through the criminal justice and education system to prepare (if possible) for their re-entry into society. With the popularization of Darwin's theory of evolution and the new science of genetics, Science sought explanations in human biology to explain why capitalism bestowed little or no value on the labor of specific populations (Paul, 1995). In other words, instead of imputing the construction of social difference as a by-product of the complex divisions of labor constructed by capitalism (i.e. material conditions), a biological basis of difference was constructed in order justify exploitation and exclusion of particular populations from the labor force. Therefore, the newly constructed etiology of disability with its complex classification of identifying conditions came into being in a historical context that Foucault (1963) describes as follows:

> Until the Renaissance, the sensibility of madness was linked to the presence of imaginary transcendences. In the classical age for the first time, madness was perceived through a condemnation of idleness and in a social immanence guaranteed by the community of labor. The community acquired an ethical power of segregation, which permitted it to eject as into another world, all forms of social uselessness. It was in this *other world*, encircled by the sacred powers of labor, that madness would assume the status we now attribute to it. If there is, in classical madness, something which refers elsewhere, and to *other things*, it is no longer because the mad-man comes from the world of the irrational and bears its stigmata; rather, it is because he crosses the frontiers of the bourgeois order

of his own accord and alienates himself outside the sacred limits of its ethic (p. 58).

Therefore, starting in the late 1800's and fueled by the fears generated by the eugenics movement, by the mid 1900's, institutions became the normal means by which deviance and in this case those labeled as disabled were "warehoused" (Blatt and Kaplan, 1966; Wolfensburger, 1974; Ferguson, 1994; Oliver, 1990). Despite evidence that the construction of disability was directly connected to the interests of capitalist accumulation in the hands of the bourgeoisie, dominant discourses have ignored this material explanation for the construction of disability and have instead treated practices like negative eugenics and institutionalization as nothing more than a product of a thought system based on a "natural" fear of deviance. By "naturalizing" disability and locating it within human biology or by treating it as a matter of bad attitudes or faulty significations, traditional history has therefore neglected to theorize "disability" as a *historical* rather than a biological category.

Using this same logic of "disability" as "deviant difference," medical science collaborated with the state to justify the unequal social divisions of labor even while it upheld the humanist vision of universal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, in order to justify why some classes (the bourgeoisie) could maintain dominance over other classes (the proletariat), the inferiority associated with the working class was attributed to "biological defects" similar to those observed in disabled individuals. Such associations of the working class with defective biologies is apparent in even modern filmic representations like the "The Elephant Man" with its eugenicist implications. Darkes (1994) describes this in the following passage:

> As a modern discourse the film *The Elephant Man* acts as a modern version of the warning of biological contamination; ....All the scenes of the working class, and their environment, are shown as dirty, disgusting, loud, violent and exploitative. This contrasts with the bourgeois scenes of clean, quiet sensibility and sensitivity. Consequently in the film all that is 'good' and 'healthy' is bourgeois, and all that is 'bad' and 'diseased' is working class. The safeguard of society is thus placed in the hygienic bourgeois world and not the unhygienic working-class one. (p. 332)

Therefore, by "naturalizing " the biological inferiority of the working classes, capitalist ideologies used the construct of "disability" to justify the unequal division of labor which was also deemed a "natural" division to capitalism.

By the same means, history witnessed the institutionalization of the sexual division of labor that organizes the allocation of labor on the basis of gender difference and at the same time devalues women's labor. Prior to capitalism, women held relative autonomy over their economical roles in household production, as artisans and as health providers in their community, where both production and reproduction were organized almost exclusively at the household level (Mies, 1986; Nakano-Glenn, 1992). Nakano-Glenn (1992) describes the transformations that occurred in area with the expansion of capitalism:

> With industrialization, production of these basic goods [for household consumption]

> gradually was taken over by capitalist industry. Reproduction, however, remained largely the responsibility of individual households....An idealized division of labor arose in which men's's work was to follow production outside the home, while women's work was to remain centered in the household....This idealized division of labor was [however] largely illusory for working class households, including immigrant and racial-ethnic families, in which men seldom earned a family wage; in these households, women and children were forced into income-earning activities in and out of the home (p. 4-5)

To support this division of labor, the capitalist state drew upon scientific claims of "biological deviance" to construct women as "naturally" inferior to men; as domestic nature and therefore incapable of participating in skilled waged labor. Further, these ideologies, by now constructing women as economically dependant on men through the process of "housewifization" (Mies, 1986) also served to reorganize the social relations in capitalism by constructing "private" social units (the nuclear family) - with the man as breadwinner and both the women and children as his dependants. Justifying this re-organization, once again on the basis of innate biological inferiority, capitalist production transformed reproductive labor (the labor required to replenish the labor force on a daily and on an intergenerational basis, and therefore essential to capitalism) as non productive labor and therefore unworthy of a wage. In this way, women were socialized into subordinate roles in the social world on the basis of biological determinism fueled by scientific conceptualizations of disability.

Mies (1986), however, points out that women did not passively give up their economic and sexual freedoms. Several women of independent means or occupations (e.g. artisans and midwives) actively resisted the control that both patriarchy and capitalism exerted over their lives. Therefore, in a move to consolidate the political authority of science, these women became the targets of violence on account of their resistance. By assigning to these women super-natural powers in order to demonstrate the "madness" in their resistance to the dominant order, the witch hunt was therefore used as the means to violently eradicate all dissent. As Mies (1986) explains:

> The witch hunt which rages through Europe from the twelfth to the seventeenth century was one of the mechanisms to control and subordinate women, the peasant and artisan, women who in their economic and sexual independence constituted a threat for the emerging bourgeois order....(T)he whole fury of the witch hunt was not just a result of the decaying old order in its confrontation with new capitalist forces, or even a manifestation of timeless male sadism, but a reaction of the new male-dominated classes against the *rebellion* of women (p. 81).

Therefore, through the logic of "deviance" capitalism with the help of science and the use of violence was not only able to justify the sexual division of labor and prescribe women's "natural" roles in society, but it was also able to institutionalize compulsory heterosexuality in order to support its continued expansion.

However, it was not just women's reproductive labor that was appropriated as non-waged labor by capitalism; so was slave labor through the violent process of colonialism. And once again, the ideology of disability was used to support biological determinist views of the

inferiority of all other races in comparison to the European race. The Enlightenment (scientific) conceptualization of "universal man" was modeled on the able bodied, white, heterosexual, European male; constructed as a "pervasive figure of racial superiority, was disciplined, constant, self responsible, of culture,... the conduit for the ubiquitous, all defining gaze of general enlightenment" (Yolton et al. 1991, p. 442). Therefore, in Enlightenment terms, the savage, originally meaning "man of the woods" was seen as "a wild uncivilized creature contrasted to the political animal identified as "European citizen"' (Yolton et al 1991, p. 473). Thus, as Yolton et al. (1991) explain:

> Rousseau's hypothetical reconstruction of natural man, relieved of all attributes and institutions which could only have been generated by society, such as reason, language, aggression and property, portrayed a simple creature whose indolent, solitary and nomadic existence bore striking similarity to the life of the real orang-utan of south-east Asia (p. 473).

This racist construction of the savage is closely imbricated in conceptions of disability, as is visible in Bogdan's (1988) text, "The Freak Show." In this book Bogdan (1988) describes the World Fairs organized in the late 1800's which exhibited disabled people as freaks so as to depict the "non-western other" in "the exotic mode." In these instances, disabled individuals, many of them in the most blatant distortion of the exotic mode {e.g. native born Americans were misrepresented as foreigners ; a tall black North Carolinian from Dahomey was exhibited as a "Wild Man from Samoa") were represented as natives of a "mysterious part of the world - darkest Africa, the Wilds of Borneo, a Turkish harem, an ancient Aztec kingdom" (p. 105). In this way, these Fairs played an important role in socializing its patrons into racist ideologies that sought to justify the violence inherent in colonialism and slavery by claiming that they were on a "civilizing" mission to tame this inalienable Otherness. Therefore, working in dialectical relationship with each other, the categories of both "race" and "disability" by being depicted as "different, depraved, dishonest, unloyal, and not really the same" (Povinelli 1994) rendered the "savage" accessible to the rest of "civil society" not as a historical subject, but as its ahistorical Other..

Through this analysis, I have therefore demonstrated how the construction of disability is a material concept - essential for capitalist accumulation to take place. Therefore, instead of conceptualizing "deviant difference" as a product of "bad" attitudes or the "unstable" sign, a historical materialist perspective would be able to explain how disability has been used to justify class divisions in society, which in turn are naturalized by reaffirming the ahistoricity of disability. As Ebert (1996) explains:

> Class societies naturalize the social division of labor by means of pre-given ("natural") attributes such as sex, race, age, gender. Difference in class societies is the difference of economic access, which is determined by the position of the subject in the social relations of production. Difference, in other words, is socially produced at the site of production. However, it is secured and legitimated by reference to the natural features of the workers (age, race, gender) in order to keep down the cost of labor power (the only source of value) and thus increase the level of profit (p. 91).

Therefore, in this concepualization, "disability" as a historical category is seen to play a central role in the construction of social difference within capitalist societies.

Border Control: The Politics of Segregation in Special Education

The ways in which the ideology of disability has been used in the continued maintenance of constructions of difference is visible in the history of schooling and particularly, in the construction of the field of special education. Historically, schools have been the sites where the "sorting" of students on the basis of abstract notions of "normalcy" and "intelligence" and the authority to label individuals on the basis of this criteria has been supported on the grounds that these distinctions have their roots in objective scientific fact. As a result, educational institutions have utilized an objective criteria based on these assumptions of "normalcy" and "intelligence" in order to monitor access to these institutions and to then justify this privileged access through modes of certification which include the granting of diplomas and degrees. Therefore, the category of disability, defined in this context as the inability to meet the "normal" requirements of the social environment becomes the basis by which differences among social population gets sorted out.

More interesting, however, is the fact, that consonant with my thesis, the ideological category of disability, particularly within schools has been used to construct classed, raced and gendered subjectivities in oppressive ways. Goodson and Dowbiggin (1989) have offered evidence that the very origins of psychiatry, one of the professions that has constructed and nurtured "deviance" within social institutions (of which the school is one such site) gained prominence as a respectable science in France, when it was able to establish its capabilities to reproduce in abstract form the dominant class relationships, division of labor and cultural hegemony present in late 19th century France. Working in the interests of the dominant social classes, psychiatry claimed to construct associations between mental illness, moral degeneracy and pauperism. In this way, the social institution of the "asylum" became an important institutional site of for the segregation, classification, and subordination of "degenerate" lower class persons and ensured their complete isolation from mainstream life, initially in institutions, and later in segregated classrooms or schools. In a similar fashion, Gould's (1981) "The Mismeasure of Man" documents in a rigorous and thorough way the construction of racist ideologies emergent in the historical context of colonialism and slavery through the very deliberate machinations of the field of psychometrics via the computation of intelligence scores based on flawed and often prejudicial "scientific" methodologies. Notwithstanding these bases, these methodologies have continued to be used to segregate individuals on the basis of their "intelligence levels" treated now as inherited, biological traits of "othered" communities and have therefore organized different education facilities and offered different educational resources to meet these varying needs. In this way, citing disability or "observable deviance" as something to be controlled, regulated, and also rehabilitated, schools have acted as effective "sorting" machines to enable children of the privileged classes (race, gender, etc..) to enhance their status, and to keep the poor in their place (Safford & Safford, 1996).

The social history of special education, in particular, has highlighted the important role special education has played in the construction, maintenance and organization of deviance. As early as 1888, the Egerton Committee in Britain had argued for separate educational systems to

serve as a means to control deviant populations. As this Committee argued:

> "The blind, deaf, dumb and the educable class of imbeciles ...if left uneducated become not only a burden to themselves but a ...burden to the state. It is in the interests of the state to educate so as to dry up, as far as possible, the minor stream which must ultimately swell into a great torrent of paupers (Tomlinson, 1982, p. 38).

In similar fashion, the first special education classes in the United States were instituted not only to teach children with both physical and mental disabilities, but were also utilized to socialize immigrant children into the "American" way of life. Sarason and Doris (1979) and Safford and Safford (1996) have thus documented that special education in the United States has its origins in racist immigration policies that sought to transform the "huddled"masses of immigrants to the United States into "American citizens" in an effort to "conserve 'American ' ideals and ensure a stabilized populace through a common language and common principles of morality" (p. 78). Fueled by racist, classist, and gendered ideologies, the nurture v. nature debate were resolved by eugenicist directives, thereby calling into play several identification technologies to separate children on the basis of their inherent capacities. In many cases, the "separate but equal" aphorism was utilized to ensure the educational segregation of African American children on the basis of Jim Crow laws - a practice that was overturned only after the pivotal court case, Brown v. Board of Education. And it was only after the passing of Public Law 94-142, modeled after the legislation instituted to eradicate school segregation on the basis of race, that students labeled disabled were by legal mandate to be integrated into classroom that represent the least restrictive environment. It is on the examination of this contentious historical terrain, that the historian of education, Michael Katz, has found cause to describe American education as "...'universal, tax-supported, compulsory, bureaucratic, racist and class biased'..., and while progressivist ideologies stressed child centeredness and social reform, in reality schooling was 'something the better part of the community did to others to make them orderly, moral, and tractable'..." (Quoted in Safford & Safford 1996; p. 87).

Among conservative circles, instituting special education, particularly for severely disabled students may appear as a radical initiative, in light of the fact that in earlier periods, disabled children and adults were often warehoused in bleak, unstimulating institutional settings. Yet, despite the seemingly progressive trajectory that special education has chosen, its practices are still enmeshed in particular paradigms that continue to treat education as the crucial socialization institution for the capitalist system. In other words, special education programs have been instituted primarily to organize and train deviance so that it can be more efficiently harnessed in the service of capitalist accumulation. Therefore, armed with competency tests that are meant to isolate the academic inefficient from the efficient, a very organized system has developed where children are grouped according to their level of "disability" and assigned into special programs. This has been well administered by the medical profession, and ably assisted by educational psychologists and psychiatrists (Tomlinson, 1982; Barton & Tomlinson, 1984; Sarason & Davis, 1979). Thus failure in school has been constructed as an illness whose cure depends on specialized treatment located in isolation from the mainstream.

It would also be easy to argue that special education particularly for severely disabled children has come into being in response to the moral imperative of equality for all - notwithstanding the severity of the disability. However, this argument also stands on shaky ground, because in fact most special education policy decisions relating to its efficacy, its funding, its resources, its facilities, its location etc.. are not in fact argued on the basis of moral imperatives, but are instead articulated in terms of profitability and productivity as measured in economic and political terms. For example, when debates have surfaced around the efficacy of public education during the Cold War period with the launching of Sputnik and more recently in reference to the findings that emerged from the education policy document "A Nation at Risk," there have often been serious implications for special education, most of them negative. Thus, in recent years, despite the move to integrate more students with disabilities into regular classrooms, new labels, like "at risk," "learning disabled," "emotionally handicapped," "gifted and talented" have emerged in order to continue to segregate children in the name of increasing standards so as to maintain a competitive edge in global markets and therefore ensure that the capitalist class in the United States maintains global economic dominance. Interestingly enough the bulk of these special education classes are also populated by students who have been marked in oppressive ways by race, class, and/or gender. For example, both Sleeter (1987) and Franklin (1987) draw linkages between the construction of the categories of learning disability and emotional disturbance and the continued maintenance of race, class, and gendered divisions in society. In this way, we can see how special education through the articulation of an ideology of disability also serves to construct and maintain the cultural and economic hegemony over dominated groups in the interests of global capitalism by organizing the racial, sexual, and class divisions in society.

Inclusive Education as Border Pedagogy: Possibilities and Limitations

It may be argued, that the historical materialist analysis I have offered is still one of economic determinism. It could also be argued, that such an analysis by seemingly adhering to correspondence theories of education (Bowles and Gintis' "Schooling in Capitalist America," Bourdieu and Passeron's "Reproduction in Society, Education and Culture," and Basil Bernstein's "Class Codes and Control,") have failed to note the possibilities of resistance theories and practices (Willis' "Learning to Labor"). It is in this context then that post-structuralist imperatives like the "border pedagogies" proposed by Giroux (1992) may appear valuable in the effort to construct a counter-ideological space of resistance:

> The concept of border pedagogy suggests more than simply opening diverse cultural histories and spaces to students. It also means understanding how fragile identity is as it moves into borderlands crisscrossed within a variety of languages, experiences, and voices. There are no unified subjects here, only students whose multi-layered and often contradictory voices and experiences intermingle with the weight of particular histories that will not fit easily into the master narrative of a monolithic culture. Such borderlands should be seen as sites for critical analysis and as a potential source of experimentation, creativity, and possibility (p. 34)

Giroux's definition of "border pedagogies" therefore sees the possibilities of radical change

within the discursive terrain of the ideological sphere - in battle over radical new meanings, alternative practices, and fluid conceptualizations of difference.

I would like to argue here that this mode of thinking can also find its echoes in the "Regular Education Initiative" - an initiative that came into being on account of the critical struggles of disabled people, their families, and their advocates. Believing that all children have potential, even those with most severe disabilities, these advocates have argued for inclusive pedagogical practices like community based instruction, cooperative learning techniques, individualized educational plans, augmentative systems of communication, cooperative learning among others - practices that focus on the realization of the multiple possibilities for disabled students, not within segregated facilities, but within the regular community. By pursuing alternatives to normative ways of teaching, these practices have also played a major part in redefining concepts of "disabled" and "normal" and have therefore done extensive work in constantly redrawing the borders of "special" and "regular" education. In doing this, Biklen et al (1989) therefore pose a radical challenges to the entire field of education, when they ask the following questions:

> Is there an alternative to a system of special and regular education which separates students making one group the insiders and the another the outsiders? Is it possible, in other words, to educate all students in a way that makes none an outsider? To be more specific can teachers create classes so that they can accommodate a wide range of differences? Can education normalize in a way that is normative rather than exclusionary and deviancy making? Can instruction in basic language or speech skills, for example, be provided to students in the same manner as instruction in writing or reading? Can community-based instruction become comparable in status as social studies?.....(p.)

It is through such challenges that Biklen just like Giroux believes that the radical possibilities of border pedagogies can in fact reinscribe the terrain of difference in a new and radical ways.

Yet, despite these claims, we cannot relinquish so easily the critical analyses that had initially drawn connections between schools and the economy. This is because despite the ways in which proponents of inclusive education have worked towards radically redefining the field of education, these redefinitions still exist within a social and economic context that nevertheless demand productivity and efficiency as the hall marks of success within capitalism, and therefore seldom question why the concept of "disability" is essential in the first place for capitalist accumulation to take As per my earlier argument, despite the critiques of determinism ranged against historical materialism emergent in the poststructuralist turn in the critical theory of schools, it is still becoming more and more apparent that schools are increasingly located right at the heart of the social division of labor that marks distinctions between mental and manual labor. As a result of this division, Apple (1995) describes how schools and universities continue to appropriate a curriculum that differentiates between "those whose later surplus labor can be utilized for the construction of new technological/administrative knowledges and [therefore] located within the slots of mental labor", where as there are others like students of difference "who rejected by this particular calculus of values are 'placed' through internal guidance and curricular programs in a trajectory that allows surplus labor to be later extracted from them in the

form of service and/or manual labor" (p. 46).

Increasingly, on account of the economic crisis in the United States it is becoming frighteningly evident that "public schools" and the associated "special" services they provide may soon outlive their usefulness to the economy. Whereas before, schools also served to construct an "industrial reserve army" from which society could draw upon in its hour of need, the current economic changes are transforming increasing numbers of workers into a redundant population on account of the global reorganization of the social relations of production. More often than not, this group of workers, now rendered redundant comprise the very poor - many of them being women and children coming from communities of color and/or marked by other forms of deviance like disability, In the face of increased cuts in social spending and the move to privatize "public schooling" this abandoned population struggling at the borders are left with few resources for survival. Living under conditions that actually deny their very humanity, their only recourse is in the construction of counter-cultural practices that serve to disrupt the smooth workings of dominant structures. However, these ruptures in the dominant cultural practices are precisely that - ruptures - and not transformative practices - because they do very little to transform the exploitative conditions under which the working class (despite its diverse access to multiple subjectivities) has to nevertheless labor under. As a result, border pedagogies, need to do much more than celebrate the transgressive possibilities that the postmodern moment has to offer.

Utopia at the Borders: Radical Visions, Radical Possibilities

How then, does historical materialism respond to the postructuralist critique that claims that it consistently upholds economic determinism in its analysis of structures of difference? If "difference" is imbricated in the historical structures of capitalism, will that only reify the structures - thereby denying the possibilities of resistance by individuals defined as disabled? Would not the possibilities within radical praxis appear daunted by the grand narrative of historical materialism which maps the complex interconnections between all nodes of difference (namely race, class, gender, sexual orientation and disability) into a common narrative of the construction of difference in global terms? It is in response to these questions that the Marxist conceptualization of "dialectics" proves to be most useful. As Bertell Ollman (1993) explains in the following passage, notwithstanding the critiques ranged against historical materialism, it in fact the method of "dialectical conceptualization' that can indeed bring us closer to a utopic vision of social, political, and economic equality within our society:

> [T]he dialectic is in its essence critical and revolutionary ... it is revolutionary, because it helps us to see the present as the moment through which our society is passing, because it forces us to examine where it came from and where it is heading as part of learning what it is, and because it enables us to grasp, that as actors as well as victims, in this process in which everyone and everything are connected, we have the power to affect it. In keeping in front of us the simple truth that everything is changing, the future is posed as a choice in which the only thing that cannot be chosen is what we already have. ... With dialectics we are made to question what changes are already occurring and what kind of changes are possible. The dialectic is revolutionary, as Brecht points out, because it helps us to pose such questions in a manner that makes effective action possible. ... A dialectical grasp of

> our society conditioned roles and the equally necessary limits and possibilities that constitute the present provides the opportunity for making a conscious and intelligent choice. In this manner does knowledge of necessity usher in the beginnings of real freedom (p. 19).

In holding on to this logic, I cite McLaren's argument (1994), that uses Frieirian principles in arguing for a critical utopinanism, that despite emphasizing notions of totality and foregrounding the necessity to transform the "imperial logic of the corporate capitalist marketplace", I nevertheless "does not preclude a strong role for human agency in developing forms of liberatory praxis (p. 206). This liberatory praxis would not only entail redrawing the borders that have historically circumscribed difference, but must also be accompanied by "systematic forms resistance through social movements and forms of counter-hegemonic struggle. Such a project demands both a 'radical optimism and a realistic caution' - in short, a critical utopianism" (p. 207); thereby also calling into play a radical pedagogy" that is at all times "situated in the context of the life world concerns of those people who could most benefit from it" and yet at the same time not located outside of the "mediations of discursive formations or of historical contexts" (p. 211).

What happens then, to the disabled subject under the present regime of exploitative capitalist conditions? On the account of the real physiological challenges that disabled people face, as well as the reality that only very few have access to technologies that can enable them to be productive as determined by laws of extraction of maximum surplus, disabled people for the large part been actively excluded from the economy. Their exclusion has often been justified on the grounds that they cannot meet the economy's needs for an efficient and productive workforce which is required to meet the socially constructed consumerism initiated by the privileged bourgeoisie. But productivity is not an objectively established given. Neither is it an imaginative myth. Instead as Ebert argues "the productivity of labor is derived not from its concrete usefulness but from its social form, which is determined by the social relations of production. It is not labor that determines its productivity; rather the productivity of labor is determined by its situation within the modes of production" (p. 102). Therefore, it follows that the only space in which disabled subject can resurrect its own subjectivity would be under conditions where labor is not commodified by imputing on it exchange value, but is instead deployed in order to produce use-values that satisfy human needs (p. 91). In other words, the only space where the disabled subject can inhabit a body that matters would be within a socialist society that precisely redefines productivity in radically new terms that disassociate its already pre-determined connection to the generation of surplus. .

In conclusion, I have therefore argued that the ability to challenge the dominant discourses that allow "human suffering and the dynamics of human struggle" (Giroux and Freire 1987; p. xi) to be rendered invisible can only be possible, if we view this as something produced out of the economic, social, and political inter-relationality of complex structures maintained on global scale by transnational capitalism. Therefore, in this paper I have attempted to remove disability from its peripheral status in the analyses of difference and instead offered a re-theorization of it as the organizing/grounding principle in the construction of the categories of gender, race, class, and sexual orientation. In doing this it also proposes an alternative critical

pedagogy - a pedagogy that provides the intellectual tools that can render visible for all students the material structures and ideological discourses that have different effects on say, black, white, lesbian, working-class, disabled, and third world students, and at the same time have to be transformed so that all students can achieve the social, economic, and political liberation.

References

Apple, M. (1995). *Education and power*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Barton, L., & Tomlinson, S. (1984). *Special Education and Social Interests*. New York: Nichols Publishing House.

Becker, H. (1964). *The other side: Perspectives on deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.

Biklen, D., & Duchan, J. (1994). "I am intelligent": The social construction of mental retardation. *Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps, 19* (3), 173-184.

Biklen, D., Ferguson, D., & Ford, A.. (eds.).(1989). *Schooling and disability*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Biklen, D., & Bogdan, R. (1977). Handicapism in America. In B. Blatt, D. Biklen, & R. Bogdan (Eds.), *An Alternative Textbook in Special Education: People, Schools, and Other Institutions* (pp). Colorado: Love Publishing House.

Blatt, B., & Kaplan, F. (1966). *Christmas in purgatory: A photographic essay on mental retardation*. Scituate Harbor: Massachussets..

Blaut, J.M. (1989). Colonialism and the rise of capitalism. *Science & Society, 53*(3), 260-296.

Bogdan, R. (1988). *Freak show: Presenting human oddities for amusement and profit*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. (1982). *Inside out: The social meaning of mental retardation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Callinicos, A. (1993). *Race and class*. Chicago: Bookmarks.

Darkes, P. (1994). The Elephant Man (David Lynch, EMI Films, 1980): An Analysis from a disabled perspective. *Disability and Society*, 9(3), 327-342.

Doyal, L. (1981). *The political economy of health*. Boston: South End Press.

Ebert, T. (1996). *Ludic feminism and after: Postmodernism, desire, and labor in late capitalism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferguson, P. (1994). *Abandoned to their fate*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fischer, E. (1996). *How to read Karl Marx*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Foucault, M. (ed.) (1975). *I, Pierre Riviere, having slaughtered my mother, my sister, and my brother...: A case of parricide in the 19th century*. Lincoln: Nebraska

Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. New York: Vintage Books

Fox, N.J. (1994). *Postmodernism, sociology, and health*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Franklin, B. (1987). The first crusade for learning disabilities: The movement for the education of backward children. In Thomas S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *The Formation of School Subjects: The Struggle for Creating an American Institution*, (pp 190-209).New York: Falmer Press.

Giroux, H. (1994). Living dangerously: Identity politics and the new cultural racism. In H. Giroux and P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*, (pp 29-55). New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings*. New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma; Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Goodson, I., & Dowbiggin, I. (1990). Docile bodies: Commonalities in the history of psychiatry and schooling. In Stephen J. Ball (Ed.), *Foucault and education: Discipline and knowledge*, (pp 105-129). New York: Routledge.

Gould, S.J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: Norton.

Harraway, D. (1990). A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980's. In Linda Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism*, (pp. 190-233). New York: Routledge.

Marx, K. (1859). A contribution to the critique of political economy. In R. Tucker (ed) *The Marx-Engels reader* (1972) 2nd edn. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Marx K, & Engels, F. (1857). *The German Ideology*. C.J. Arthur (ed.) 1989. New York: International Publishers.

McLaren, P. (1989). On ideology and education: Critical pedagogy and the cultural politics of resistance. In H. Giroux and P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle*, (pp. 174-202). Albany: State University of New York Press.

McLaren, P. (1994). Postmodernism and the death of politics: A Brazilian reprieve. In P. McLaren, and C. Lamkshear (Eds.), *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire*, (pp. 193-215). New York: Routledge.

Mercer, J. (1973). *Labeling the mentally retarded: Clinical and social systems Perspectives on mental retardation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mies, M. (1986). *Patriarchy and accumulation on a world Scale: Women in the international division of labor*. New Jersey: Zed Books.

Nakano-Glenn, E. (1992). From servitude to service work: Historical continuities in the racial division of paid reproductive work. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, *18*(1), 1-18.

O'Brien, M. (1987). Education and patriarchy. In D.W. Livingstone (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy and cultural power*, (pp. 41-54). Massachussets: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Ollman, B. (1993). *Dialectical investigations*. New York: Routledge.

Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement: A sociological approach*. New York: St.Martin's Press.

Paul, D. (1995). *Controlling human heredity: 1865 to the present*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International.

Peter, J. & Favret, J. (1975). The Animal, the madman, and death. In M. Foucault (Ed.), *I, Pierre Riviere, having slaughtered my mother, my sister, and my brother...: A Case of parricide in the 19th century*, (pp 175-199). Lincoln: Nebraska

Rodney, W. (1981). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Sandoval, C. (1995). Cyborg feminism and the methodology of the oppressed. In C. Gray (Ed.), *The cyborg handbook*, (pp 407-422). New York Routledge.

Safford, P., & Safford, E. (1996). *A history of childhood and disability*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1992). *Controversial issues confronting special education*. Massachussets: Allyn and Bacon.

Stone, D. (1984). *The disabled state*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sarason, S., & Doris, J. (1979). *Educational handicap, public policy, and social history: A broadened perspective on mental retardation*. New York: The Free Press.

Sleeter, C. (1987). Why is there learning disability: A critical analysis of the birth of the field in its social context. In Thomas S. Popkewitz (Ed.), The formation of school subjects: The struggle for creating an american institution, (pp 190-209). New York: Falmer Press.

Sleeter, C., & McLaren, P. (eds). (1995). *Multicultural education, Critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Tomlinson, S. (1982). *The sociology of special education*. Boston: Routlege & Kegan Paul.

Trent (Jr.), J. (1994). *Inventing the feeble mind: A history of mental retardation in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolfensburger. W. (1976). *The origin and nature of our institutional models*. Syracuse: Human Policy Press.

Weis, L. (1988). *Class, race, and gender in american education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (1992). *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, gender in United States schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Yolton, J. , Porter, R., Rogers, P., & Stafford, B. (1991). *The Blackwell companion to the Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.:

Zavarzadeh, Masud. (1989). Theory as Resistance. *Rethinking Marxism*, *2*, 49-70.